

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION  
Biennial Budget - FY2001-03

**Project Proposal - Summary Sheet**

Entity	Project	FY2002	FY2003
ESU 7/Wayne State College/Central Community College	Bridging the Telecommunications Gap	\$ 504,750	\$2,167,234

**SUMMARY OF REQUEST** (Executive Summary from the Proposal)

This project seeks to remedy the situation of un-funded distance learning schools by providing funding to permit the 38 school districts wanting 2-way interactive video delivery within their secondary schools to connect to surrounding schools as well as to colleges and universities across the State of Nebraska. Interconnections to existing consortiums will be built into the project to bridge the gap between the various interactive technologies within the state to form one system. Finally, this project will allow the Technical Panel of the Nebraska Information Technology Commission (NITC) to implement a statewide telecommunications infrastructure involving the best technical standards. Such standards would permit all public educational institutions the ability to interconnect with a scalable inter-operative system that is future-driven yet cost effective.

**FUNDING SUMMARY**

Description	Request for FY2002 (Year 1)	Request for FY2003 (Year 2)	Request for FY2004 (Year 3)	Request for FY2005 (Year 4)	Future (Years 5 - 11)	Total
<b>2. Contractual Services</b>						
2.1 Pre-engineering Design		\$1,000,000				\$ 1,000,000
2.2 Installation of Connections		76,000				\$ 76,000
<b>3. Telecommunications</b>						
3.1 State Interconnection to ATM Switch in Columbus, Nebraska		68,748	\$68,748	\$ 68,748	\$481,236	\$ 687,480
3.2 Installation of Interconnection		1,236				\$ 1,236
<b>4. Capital Expenditures</b>						
4.1 Classroom Equipment						\$ -
25% Down Payment	\$ 289,750					\$ 289,750
Balance of Payment		869,250				\$ 869,250
Installation of Equipment		152,000				\$ 152,000
4.2 Statewide Scheduling System	180,000					\$ 180,000
4.3 Licenses for Existing Consortiums to Access Scheduling	25,000					\$ 25,000
4.4 Access to Neb*Sat Connection for ESU 7	\$ 10,000					\$ 10,000
<b>TOTAL COSTS</b>	<b>\$ 504,750</b>	<b>\$2,167,234</b>	<b>\$68,748</b>	<b>\$ 68,748</b>	<b>\$481,236</b>	<b>\$ 3,290,716</b>
General Funds						\$ -
Cash Funds						\$ -
Federal Funds						\$ -
Revolving Funds						\$ -
Other Funds - Program 99	\$ 504,750	\$2,167,234	\$68,748	\$ 68,748	\$481,236	\$ 3,290,716
<b>TOTAL FUNDS</b>	<b>\$ 504,750</b>	<b>\$2,167,234</b>	<b>\$68,748</b>	<b>\$ 68,748</b>	<b>\$481,236</b>	<b>\$ 3,290,716</b>

NEBRASKA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION  
Biennial Budget - FY2001-03

**Project Proposal - Summary Sheet**

**PROJECT SCORE**

	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3	Mean	Maximum Possible
Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes	8	10	9	9.0	10
Section V: Project Justification / Business Case	6	4	7	5.7	10
Section VI: Implementation	4	2	7	4.3	10
Section VII: Technical Impact	9	3	9	7.0	10
Section VIII: Risk Assessment	6	2	7	5.0	8
Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget	4	5	4	4.3	5
<b>TOTAL</b>				<b>35</b>	<b>53</b>

**REVIEWER COMMENTS**

**Section IV: Scope and Projected Outcomes**

Reviewer 2: Do we want to measure the effectiveness of the program? Could we assess whether there is an increase in college bound students after distance learning is implemented? How about an increase in grade point average? Are there other measurements of the effectiveness of distance learning applications?

Reviewer 3: Case is well made and lateness of request explained. Lateness keeps project from being ranked with other distance learning projects. Not sure how this will / should effect consideration.

**Section V: Project Justification / Business Case**

Reviewer 1: The project proposal neglected to address economic impacts including cost/benefit and life cycle cost analysis.

Reviewer 2: The submitter did not totally follow the format of the review document, making it difficult to grade specific points. Much of the text is relevant, but difficult to plug into the appropriate measures.

**Section VI: Implementation**

Reviewer 1: The project neglected to address several aspects regarding implementation including the roles of the project sponsors, training requirements, and on-going maintenance and support.

Reviewer 2: Much of the information regarding stakeholder buy-in and acceptance is speculative at best.

Reviewer 3: Some detail not available due to fact that the specific technology will be determined by outcome of TINA and standards efforts of others. No statement given as to how the project might be different or have different outcomes if the 3 ranked DS-3 projects linked in this section are not funded.

**Section VII: Technical Impact**

Reviewer 2: The plan is based on possible, but not certain, developments in the distance learning environment in Nebraska. Most of the changes required are under study by various sub-committees of the NITC.

Reviewer 3: This project and STEP project intended to adopt next standard for the state. Good forward looking plan.

**Section VIII: Risk Assessment**

Reviewer 2: The risks identified are valid.

Reviewer 3: Impact is minimal if not completed exactly as recommended since the recommendation is to adopt whatever the new standard turns out to be. Technology specified is for budgetary purposes.

**Section IX: Financial Analysis and Budget**

Reviewer 2: Aside from the fact that the format of the proposal form was somewhat ignored, and that there are an enormous number of assumptions expressed, we believe the project is worthy. In checking with some of the industry representatives regarding costs and regarding some of the statements made relative to interoperability with the existing system, there is a general consensus of agreement with most of the statements.

Reviewer 3: The document notes a number of ways in which the budget may change. It is likely that the probable changes indicated will make the current budget high.